

TRISECANT LINES AND JACOBIANS, II

OLIVIER DEBARRE^(*)**1. Introduction**

Let (X, θ) be a complex principally polarized abelian variety. Symmetric representatives Θ of the polarization differ by translations by points of order 2, hence the linear system $|2\Theta|$ is independent on the choice of Θ . It defines a morphism $K : X \rightarrow |2\Theta|^*$, whose image is the *Kummer variety* $K(X)$ of X . When (X, θ) is the Jacobian of an algebraic curve, there are infinitely many *trisecants* to $K(X)$, i.e. lines in the projective space $|2\Theta|^*$ that meet $K(X)$ in at least 3 points. Welters conjectured in [W] that the existence of *one* trisecant line to the Kummer variety should characterize Jacobians among all indecomposable principally polarized abelian varieties, thereby giving one answer to the Schottky problem.

The aim of this article is to improve on the results of [D], where a partial answer to this problem was given under additional hypotheses. More precisely, our main theorem implies that *an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety (X, λ) is a Jacobian if and only if there exist points a, b, c of X such that:*

- (i) *the subgroup of X generated by $a - b$ and $b - c$ is dense in X ,*
- (ii) *the points $K(a)$, $K(b)$ and $K(c)$ are distinct and collinear.*

The method is basically the same as in [D]: we prove that the existence of one trisecant line implies the existence of a one-dimensional family of such lines. Welters' criterion ([W]) then yields the conclusion.

2. The set up

Let (X, λ) be a complex indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety, let Θ be a symmetric representative of the polarization and let $K : X \rightarrow |2\Theta|^*$ be the Kummer morphism. Let θ be a non-zero section of $\mathcal{O}_X(\Theta)$. For any $x \in X$, we write Θ_x for the divisor $\Theta + x$ and θ_x for the section $z \mapsto \theta(z - x)$ of $\mathcal{O}_X(\Theta_x)$. If a, b and c are points of X , it is classical that the points $K(a), K(b)$ and $K(c)$ are collinear if and only if there exist complex numbers α, β and γ not all zero such that:

$$\alpha\theta_a\theta_{-a} + \beta\theta_b\theta_{-b} + \gamma\theta_c\theta_{-c} = 0.$$

Following Welters, we consider the set:

$$V_{a,b,c} = 2 \{ \zeta \in X \mid K(\zeta + a), K(\zeta + b), K(\zeta + c) \text{ are collinear} \}$$

(*) Partially supported by N.S.F. Grant DMS 92-03919 and the European Science Project "Geometry of Algebraic Varieties", Contract no. SCI-0398-C (A).

endowed with its natural scheme structure. By [W], theorem 0.5, (X, λ) is a Jacobian if and only if there exist points a, b and c such that $\dim V_{a,b,c} > 0$. This condition is equivalent to the existence of a sequence $\{D_n\}_{n>0}$ of constant vector fields on X and of a formal curve $\zeta(\epsilon) = \zeta(0) + \frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)$ with $D(\epsilon) = \sum_{n>0} D_n \epsilon^n$, contained in $V_{a,b,c}$. This in turn is equivalent to a relation of the type:

$$\alpha(\epsilon)\theta_{a+\zeta(\epsilon)}\theta_{-a-\zeta(\epsilon)} + \beta(\epsilon)\theta_{b+\zeta(\epsilon)}\theta_{-b-\zeta(\epsilon)} + \gamma(\epsilon)\theta_{c+\zeta(\epsilon)}\theta_{-c-\zeta(\epsilon)} = 0 ,$$

where $\alpha(\epsilon), \beta(\epsilon)$ and $\gamma(\epsilon)$ are relatively prime elements of $\mathbf{C}[[\epsilon]]$.

3. The case of a degenerate trisecant

In this section, we prove the following result:

THEOREM 3.1.— *Let (X, λ) be a complex indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety, let Θ be a symmetric representative of the polarization and let $K : X \rightarrow |\mathbf{2}\Theta|^*$ be the Kummer morphism. Assume that there exist two points u and v of X such that:*

- (i) *the points $K(u)$ and $K(v)$ are distinct and non-singular on $K(X)$ and the line that joins them is tangent to $K(X)$ at $K(u)$,*
- (ii) $\text{codim}_X \bigcap_{s \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{2su} > 2$.

Then (X, λ) is isomorphic to the Jacobian of a smooth algebraic curve.

Note that condition (ii) in the theorem holds when u generates X .

Proof. As explained in section 2, it is enough to prove that the scheme $V_{u,-u,v}$ has positive dimension at 0: we look for a sequence $\{D_n\}_{n>0}$ of constant vector fields on X with $D_1 \neq 0$ and relatively prime elements $\alpha(\epsilon), \beta(\epsilon)$ and $\gamma(\epsilon)$ of $\mathbf{C}[[\epsilon]]$ such that:

$$(3.2) \quad \alpha(\epsilon)\theta_{u+\frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)}\theta_{-u-\frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)} + \beta(\epsilon)\theta_{-u+\frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)}\theta_{u-\frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)} + \gamma(\epsilon)\theta_{v+\frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)}\theta_{-v-\frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon)} = 0 ,$$

with $D(\epsilon) = \sum_{n>0} D_n \epsilon^n$. This is nothing but equation (1.4) from [D]. It follows from *loc.cit.* that we may assume:

$$\alpha(\epsilon) = 1 + \sum_{n>0} \alpha_n \epsilon^n \quad , \quad \beta(\epsilon) = -1 \quad , \quad \gamma(\epsilon) = \epsilon \quad .$$

Write the left-hand-side of (3.2) as $\sum_{n \geq 0} P_n \epsilon^n$, where, for any $n \geq 0$, P_n is a section of $\mathcal{O}_X(2\Theta)$. One has $P_0 = 0$ and:

$$(3.3) \quad P_1 = \alpha_1 \theta_u \theta_{-u} + \theta_u D_1 \theta_{-u} - \theta_{-u} D_1 \theta_u + \theta_v \theta_{-v} .$$

As explained in *loc.cit.*, hypothesis (i) in the theorem is equivalent to the vanishing of P_1 for a suitable D_1 tangent at $K(u)$ to the line that joins $K(u)$ and

$K(v)$, and a suitable α_1 . In general, note that P_n depends only on $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and $D_1, \dots, D_n$. Knowing that P_1 vanishes, we need to construct a sequence $\{D_n\}_{n>0}$ of constant vector fields on X and a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n>1}$ of complex numbers such that P_n vanishes for all positive integers n .

We proceed by induction: let n be an integer ≥ 2 and assume that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}$ and $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}$ have been constructed so that $P_1 = \dots = P_{n-1} = 0$. We want to find a complex number α_n and a tangent vector D_n such that P_n vanishes on X . By lemma 1.8 from *loc.cit.*, it is enough to show that the restriction of P_n to the scheme $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$ (which depends only on $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}$ and $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}$) vanishes. It is convenient to set:

$$R(z, \epsilon) = P(z + \frac{1}{2}D(\epsilon), \epsilon) = \sum_{n>0} R_n(z) \epsilon^n .$$

Our induction hypothesis can be rewritten as $R_1 = \dots = R_{n-1} = 0$ and $P_n = R_n$. ■
Therefore, we need to prove that R_n vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$. We begin by proving a few identities independent on the induction hypothesis. Note that:

$$(3.4) \quad R(z, \epsilon) = \alpha(\epsilon)\theta(z-u)\theta(z+u+D(\epsilon)) - \theta(z+u)\theta(z-u+D(\epsilon)) + \epsilon\theta(z-v)\theta(z+v+D(\epsilon)) .$$

It follows that for any z in Θ_u , one has:

$$(3.5) \quad R(z, \epsilon) = -\theta(z+u)\theta(z-u+D(\epsilon)) + \epsilon\theta(z-v)\theta(z+v+D(\epsilon))$$

$$(3.6) \quad R(z-2u, \epsilon) = \alpha(\epsilon)\theta(z-3u)\theta(z-u+D(\epsilon)) + \epsilon\theta(z-2u-v)\theta(z-2u+v+D(\epsilon))$$

$$(3.7) \quad R(z-u+v, \epsilon) = \alpha(\epsilon)\theta(z-2u+v)\theta(z+v+D(\epsilon)) - \theta(z+v)\theta(z-2u+v+D(\epsilon)) .$$

Moreover, since P_1 and its translate by $2u$ both vanish, formula (3.3) yields, for any z in Θ_u :

$$(3.8) \quad \theta(z+u)D_1\theta(z-u) - \theta(z+v)\theta(z-v) = 0$$

$$(3.9) \quad \theta(z-3u)D_1\theta(z-u) + \theta(z-2u+v)\theta(z-2u-v) = 0.$$

The following result is the main technical step of the proof.

LEMMA 3.10.— *For any point z in Θ_u , one has:*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\epsilon)R(z, \epsilon)\theta(z-3u)D_1\theta(z-u) + R(z-2u, \epsilon)\theta(z+u)D_1\theta(z-u) \\ + \epsilon R(z-u+v, \epsilon)\theta(z-v)\theta(z-2u-v) = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7), the left-hand-side of the expression in the lemma is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\alpha(\epsilon) \theta(z-u+D(\epsilon)) \theta(z+u) \theta(z-3u) D_1\theta(z-u) \\
& +\epsilon\alpha(\epsilon) \theta(z+v+D(\epsilon)) \theta(z-v) \theta(z-3u) D_1\theta(z-u) \\
& +\alpha(\epsilon) \theta(z-u+D(\epsilon)) \theta(z-3u) \theta(z+u) D_1\theta(z-u) \\
& +\epsilon \theta(z-2u+v+D(\epsilon)) \theta(z-2u-v) \theta(z+u) D_1\theta(z-u) \\
& +\epsilon\alpha(\epsilon) \theta(z+v+D(\epsilon)) \theta(z-2u+v) \theta(z-v) \theta(z-2u-v) \\
& -\epsilon \theta(z-2u+v+D(\epsilon)) \theta(z+v) \theta(z-v) \theta(z-2u-v) .
\end{aligned}$$

In this sum, the first and third terms cancel out; the second and fifth cancel out by (3.9) and the fourth and sixth by (3.8). Hence the sum vanishes. ■

Recall that we are assuming $R_1 = \dots = R_{n-1} = 0$. Since $\alpha(\epsilon) \equiv 1$ modulo ϵ , the identity of the lemma taken modulo ϵ^{n+1} yields:

$$\forall z \in \Theta_u \quad D_1\theta(z-u) [R_n(z)\theta(z-3u) + R_n(z-2u)\theta(z+u)] = 0 .$$

Since Θ_u is integral and D_1 is non-zero, we get:

$$(3.11) \quad \forall z \in \Theta_u \quad R_n(z)\theta(z-3u) + R_n(z-2u)\theta(z+u) = 0 .$$

LEMMA 3.12.— *If F is a section of a line bundle on X such that $R_n F$ vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$, then, for any integer s , the section $R_n F_{2su}$ also vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that $R_n F_{2u}$ vanishes on $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$ since $R_n F_{-2u}$ is its image by the involution $x \mapsto -x$. There exist two sections A and B such that $R_n F = A\theta_u + B\theta_{-u}$. It follows that $(R_n)_{2u} F_{2u} \equiv A_{2u}\theta_{3u} \pmod{\theta_u}$. Multiplying (3.11) by F_{2u} , we get:

$$R_n F_{2u} \theta_{3u} + A_{2u} \theta_{3u} \theta_{-u} \equiv 0 \pmod{\theta_u} .$$

Since $2u \neq 0$ (because $K(u)$ is non-singular) and Θ_u is integral, θ_{3u} is not a zero divisor modulo θ_u and we get $R_n F_{2u} \equiv 0 \pmod{(\theta_u, \theta_{-u})}$. ■

The lemma immediately yields that $R_n \theta_{u+2su}$ vanishes on $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$ for all s . Hypothesis (ii) in the theorem guaranties that the scheme $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{u+2su}$ has codimension > 2 in X . Since the scheme $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$ has pure codimension 2, it follows that R_n vanishes there. This concludes the proof of the theorem. ■

Theorem 6.2 below shows that the conclusion of theorem 3.1 still holds with a hypothesis slightly different from (ii).

4. The case of a non-degenerate trisecant

In this section, we prove, under an extra hypothesis, that the existence of a non-degenerate trisecant line implies the existence of a degenerate trisecant of the type studied in section 3. We prove:

THEOREM 4.1.— *Let (X, λ) be an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety, let Θ be a symmetric representative of the polarization and let $K : X \rightarrow |2\Theta|^*$ be the Kummer morphism. Assume that there exist points a, b and c of X such that:*

- (i) *the points $K(a), K(b)$ and $K(c)$ are distinct and collinear,*
- (ii) $\text{codim}_X \bigcap_{\substack{p, q, r \in \mathbf{Z} \\ p+q+r=0}} \Theta_{pa+qb+rc} > 2$.

Then (X, λ) is isomorphic to the Jacobian of a smooth algebraic curve.

Note that condition (ii) in the theorem holds when $a - b$ and $b - c$ together generate X .

Proof. Instead of proving that $V_{a,b,c}$ has positive dimension at 0, we will proceed as follows. As explained in section 2, condition (i) translates into the existence of non-zero complex numbers α, β and γ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \alpha\theta_a\theta_{-a} + \beta\theta_b\theta_{-b} + \gamma\theta_c\theta_{-c} = 0 .$$

For any x in X , we will write P^x for $\theta_{a+b+c}\theta_{-x}$. Our first aim is to show that P^c vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$.

LEMMA 4.3.— *One has:*

$$P_{a-b}^c\theta_b + P^c\theta_{2a-b} \equiv 0 \quad (\text{mod } \theta_a) .$$

Proof. Equation (4.2) and its translates by $(a + c)$ and $(a - b)$ yield, modulo θ_a :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta\theta_b\theta_{-b} + \gamma\theta_c\theta_{-c} &\equiv 0 \\ \alpha\theta_{2a+c}\theta_c + \beta\theta_{a+b+c}\theta_{a-b+c} &\equiv 0 \\ \alpha\theta_{2a-b}\theta_{-b} + \gamma\theta_{a-b+c}\theta_{a-b-c} &\equiv 0 . \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, still modulo θ_a :

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\beta\theta_{-b} (P_{a-b}^c\theta_b + P^c\theta_{2a-b}) \\ &\equiv \theta_{2a+c}\theta_{a-b-c} (-\alpha\gamma\theta_c\theta_{-c}) + \theta_{a+b+c}\theta_{-c} (-\beta\gamma\theta_{a-b+c}\theta_{a-b-c}) \\ &\equiv -\gamma\theta_{a-b-c}\theta_{-c}(\alpha\theta_{2a+c}\theta_c + \beta\theta_{a+b+c}\theta_{a-b+c}) \\ &\equiv 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Since Θ is integral and $-b \neq a$, the section θ_{-b} is not a zero divisor modulo θ_a and the lemma follows. ■

LEMMA 4.4.– *If F is a section of a line bundle on X such that $P^c F$ vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$, then, for any integer s , the section $P^c F_{s(a-b)}$ also vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$.*

Proof. Since a and b play the same role, it is enough to prove that $P^c F_{a-b}$ vanishes on $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$. Let A and B be two sections such that $P^c F = A\theta_a + B\theta_b$. Then $P^c_{a-b} F_{a-b} \equiv A_{a-b} \theta_{2a-b} \pmod{\theta_a}$. Using lemma 4.3, we get:

$$P^c F_{a-b} \theta_{2a-b} + A_{a-b} \theta_{2a-b} \theta_b \equiv 0 \pmod{\theta_a}.$$

Since $(2a-b) \neq a$ and Θ_a is irreducible, we can divide out by θ_{2a-b} , and the lemma is proved. ■

LEMMA 4.5.– *If F is a section of a line bundle on X , then $P^c F$ vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$ if and only if $P^b F$ vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_c$.*

Proof. Write:

$$\theta_{a+b+c} \theta_{-c} F \equiv A \theta_b \pmod{\theta_a}.$$

Then, on Θ_a :

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma A \theta_b \theta_c &\equiv \theta_{a+b+c} \gamma \theta_c \theta_{-c} F \\ &\equiv -\theta_{a+b+c} \beta \theta_b \theta_{-b} F \\ &= -\beta P^b F \theta_b, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.2). Since Θ_a is irreducible and $a \neq b$, the lemma is proved. ■

We now combine the last two lemmas to get, for all integers r and s :

$$\begin{aligned} &P^c F &&\equiv 0 &&\pmod{(\theta_a, \theta_b)} \\ \implies &P^b F &&\equiv 0 &&\pmod{(\theta_a, \theta_c)} \\ \implies &P^b F_{r(a-c)} &&\equiv 0 &&\pmod{(\theta_a, \theta_c)} \\ \implies &P^c F_{r(a-c)} &&\equiv 0 &&\pmod{(\theta_a, \theta_b)} \\ \implies &P^c F_{r(a-c)+s(a-b)} &&\equiv 0 &&\pmod{(\theta_a, \theta_b)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows in particular that $P^c \theta_{a+r(a-c)+s(a-b)}$ vanishes on $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$ for all integers r and s . Hypothesis (ii) in the theorem then implies:

$$(4.6) \quad P^c \text{ vanishes on the scheme } \Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$$

(hence also P^a on $\Theta_b \cap \Theta_c$ and P^b on $\Theta_c \cap \Theta_a$).

Let u be any point of X such that $2u = a - b$ and set $v = u - a - c$. Translating (4.6) by $(-u - b)$, we get that $\theta_v \theta_{-v}$ vanishes on $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$. As explained in [D], this is equivalent to the existence of a complex number α_1 and a tangent vector D_1 to X such that:

$$(4.7) \quad \alpha_1 \theta_u \theta_{-u} + \theta_u D_1 \theta_{-u} - \theta_{-u} D_1 \theta_u + \theta_v \theta_{-v} = 0.$$

In other words, the line that joins $K(u)$ and $K(v)$ is tangent to $K(X)$ at $K(u)$. Note that we cannot apply theorem 3.1 directly, since hypothesis (ii) is not satisfied. However, we will still follow the same method, i.e. we will show that the scheme $V_{a,b,-c}$ (which is a translate of $V_{u,-u,v}$) has positive dimension at $(-a - b)$, but we will need to prove at the same time that $V_{a,-b,c}$ has positive dimension at the point $(-a - c)$.

Let n be an integer ≥ 1 . As in section 3, the scheme $V_{a,b,-c}$ contains a scheme isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^{n+1}$ and concentrated at $(-a - b)$ if and only if one can find complex numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and tangent vectors $D_1, \dots, D_n$ such that $R_1, \dots, R_n$, defined in section 3, vanish (α_1 and D_1 are the same as in (4.7), and R_1 is the left-hand-side of that equation). Similarly, the scheme $V_{a,-b,c}$ contains a scheme isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^{n+1}$ and concentrated at $(-a - c)$ if and only if there exist complex numbers $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_n$ and tangent vectors $D'_1, \dots, D'_n$ such that $R'_1, \dots, R'_n$ vanish.

We proceed as in section 3: let n be an integer ≥ 2 and assume that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}$, $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{n-1}$ and $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}, D'_1, \dots, D'_{n-1}$ have been constructed so that $R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}$, $R'_1, \dots, R'_{n-1}$ vanish on X . As in the proof of theorem 3.1, it is enough to show that the restriction of R_n to the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$ (which depends only on $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}$ and $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}$), and the restriction of R'_n to $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_c$ (which depends only on $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{n-1}$ and $D'_1, \dots, D'_{n-1}$) both vanish. By lemma 3.12, we have:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} R_n \theta_{a+s(a-b)} & \text{ vanishes on the scheme } \Theta_a \cap \Theta_b \\ R_n \theta_{a+s(a-c)} & \text{ vanishes on the scheme } \Theta_a \cap \Theta_c \end{aligned}$$

for all integers s .

LEMMA 4.9.— *For any integer s such that $0 < s < n$, one has $\beta^s D'_s = (-\gamma)^s D_s$.*

Proof. Formula (3.4) translates into:

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} R(z, \epsilon) = & \alpha(\epsilon) \theta(z - a) \theta(z - b + D(\epsilon)) - \theta(z - b) \theta(z - a + D(\epsilon)) \\ & + \epsilon \theta(z + c) \theta(z - a - b - c + D(\epsilon)) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} R'(z, \epsilon) = & \alpha'(\epsilon) \theta(z - a) \theta(z - c + D'(\epsilon)) - \theta(z - c) \theta(z - a + D'(\epsilon)) \\ & + \epsilon \theta(z + b) \theta(z - a - b - c + D'(\epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.2), we get:

$$\gamma R_1 \theta_c + \beta R'_1 \theta_b \equiv -\theta_b \theta_c (\gamma D_1 + \beta D'_1) \theta_a \pmod{\theta_a} .$$

Since R_1 and R'_1 vanish, we get $\gamma D_1 + \beta D'_1 = 0$. We complete the proof by induction on s . Assume that $s < n$ and that $\beta^t D'_t = (-\gamma)^t D_t$ whenever $0 < t < s$. This is equivalent to $D'(\beta\epsilon) \equiv D(-\gamma\epsilon) \pmod{\epsilon^s}$. Using again (4.10) and (4.11), we get:

$$R(\cdot, -\gamma\epsilon)\theta_c - R'(\cdot, \beta\epsilon)\theta_b \equiv -\theta_b \theta_c ((-\gamma)^s D_s - \beta^s D'_s) \theta_a \pmod{(\theta_a, \epsilon^{s+1})} .$$

Since R and R' vanish modulo ϵ^{s+1} , we get $(-\gamma)^s D_s - \beta^s D'_s = 0$ and the lemma follows. ■

LEMMA 4.13.— *Let F be a section of a line bundle on X . Then $R_n F$ vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$ if and only if $R'_n F$ vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_c$.*

Proof. Our assumption is that $R_n F \equiv A\theta_b \pmod{\theta_a}$. Formula (4.12) is still valid for $s = n$ and reads $(-\gamma)^n R_n \theta_c - \beta^n R'_n \theta_b \equiv -\theta_b \theta_c ((-\gamma)^n D_n - \beta^n D'_n) \theta_a \pmod{\theta_a}$. Multiplying this congruence by F , we get:

$$(-\gamma)^n A \theta_b \theta_c - \beta^n R'_n F \theta_b \equiv -\theta_b \theta_c F ((-\gamma)^n D_n - \beta^n D'_n) \theta_a \pmod{\theta_a} .$$

Since Θ_a is irreducible and $a \neq b$, one can divide out by θ_b . This finishes the proof of the lemma. ■

The argument used right after the proof of lemma 4.5 and (4.8) immediately yield that if $R_n F$ vanishes on $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$, then $R_n \theta_{a+r(a-c)+s(a-b)}$ vanishes on $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$ for all integers r and s . Hypothesis (ii) then implies that R_n vanishes on $\Theta_a \cap \Theta_b$, which concludes the proof of the theorem. ■

5. The most degenerate case: the K-P equation

On the Jacobian of a smooth projective curve, there exists a 2-dimensional family of trisecant lines. If one lets the points of contact tend to a singular point of the Kummer variety in a suitable way, one gets that the theta function θ of a Jacobian satisfies the Kadomcev-Petviashvili (or K-P) equation:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1^4 \theta \cdot \theta - 4D_1^3 \theta \cdot D_1 \theta + 3(D_1^2 \theta)^2 - 3(D_2 \theta)^2 \\ + 3D_2^2 \theta \cdot \theta + 3D_1 \theta \cdot D_3 \theta - 3D_1 D_3 \theta \cdot \theta + d_3 \theta^2 = 0 , \end{aligned}$$

for some constant vector fields D_1, D_2, D_3 and complex number d_3 . Shiota proved in [S] that Jacobians are characterized among indecomposable principally polarized

abelian varieties by this property. His proof was later simplified by Arbarello and De Concini in [AC], but they still had to rely on the technical but crucial lemma 7 from [S]. In this section, we will try to relate our approach to the (discrete) trisecant conjecture to the techniques used in those two articles.

Let (X, λ) be an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety which satisfies the K-P equation, and let Θ be a symmetric representative of the polarization. The article [AC] reduces the proof that (X, λ) is a Jacobian to showing that each element of a certain sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 2}$ of sections of $\mathcal{O}_X(2\Theta)$ vanishes, where $P_3 = 0$ is the K-P equation, and where each P_n depends on tangent vectors $D_1, \dots, D_n$ and complex numbers $d_3, \dots, d_n$ (where D_1, D_2, D_3 and d_3 are the same as in the K-P equation). Let n be an integer > 3 . As we did in sections 3 and 4, we assume that $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}$ and $d_3, \dots, d_{n-1}$ are such that $P_3, \dots, P_{n-1}$ vanish; it was shown in *loc.cit.* that it is enough to prove that the restriction of P_n to the scheme $D_1\Theta$ defined by $\theta = D_1\theta = 0$ vanishes. This restriction depends only on $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}$ and $d_3, \dots, d_{n-1}$.

STEP 1.— *The following relation holds on Θ :*

$$D_1 P_n \cdot D_1 \theta - P_n \cdot D_1^2 \theta = 0 .$$

Proof. This identity should be thought of as the analog of (3.11) and ought to follow from a relation similar to 3.10, but I was unfortunately unable to find it. It is however a consequence of the following equality, valid on X and proved algebraically in [AC] under the assumption that $P_3, \dots, P_{n-1}$ vanish:

$$\theta^4 \left(\frac{1}{3} D_1^4 + D_2^2 - D_1 D_3 + 4 D_1 \left((D_1^2 \log \theta) \cdot D_1 \right) \right) P_n = 0 .$$

Indeed, a direct calculation shows that the left-hand-side is equal to:

$$8 \frac{(D_1 \theta)^2}{\theta} (P_n \cdot D_1^2 \theta - D_1 P_n \cdot D_1 \theta) + \text{regular fonction} .$$

This finishes the proof. ■

Another interpretation of this first step is that it is equivalent to the vanishing of the residue necessary to solve locally, outside of $D_1\Theta$, the equation $D_1 h = \frac{P_n}{\theta^2}$. This is the method used in [AC].

STEP 2.— *Let F be a section of a line bundle on X . If $P_n F$ vanishes on $D_1\Theta$, then $P_n D_1 F$ vanishes on $D_1\Theta$.*

Proof. Write $P_n F = A\theta + B D_1 \theta$ and take the D_1 -derivative:

$$D_1 P_n \cdot F + P_n \cdot D_1 F = D_1 A \cdot \theta + A \cdot D_1 \theta + D_1 B \cdot D_1 \theta + B \cdot D_1^2 \theta .$$

Multiply by P_n and use step 1 and the equality $P_n F = A\theta + BD_1\theta$ to get:

$$D_1 P_n \cdot B \cdot D_1 \theta + P_n^2 \cdot D_1 F \equiv (A + D_1 B) \cdot P_n \cdot D_1 \theta + B \cdot D_1 P_n \cdot D_1 \theta \pmod{\theta},$$

hence

$$P_n(P_n \cdot D_1 F - (A + D_1 B) \cdot D_1 \theta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\theta}.$$

Since Θ is irreducible, one of the two factors vanishes on Θ , which proves our contention. ■

It follows that for any positive integer s , the section $P_n \cdot D_1^s \theta$ vanishes on $D_1 \theta$. If the codimension of $\Sigma = \bigcap_{s \geq 0} D_1^s \Theta$ in X is > 2 , the section P_n vanishes on $D_1 \Theta$. This yields a completely algebraic proof of the Novikov conjecture, under the additional hypothesis $\text{codim}_X \bigcap_{s \geq 0} D_1^s \Theta > 2$, which slightly improves on the main theorem of [AC]. See also the end of the next section for another algebraic proof with a slightly different hypothesis.

To get rid of this extra assumption, one needs lemma 7 from [S], which shows essentially that the K-P equation implies that Σ is equal to $\bigcap_{r,s,t \geq 0} D_1^r D_2^s D_3^t \Theta$ (as schemes, although we will only use the equality as sets). Following Shiota, we work on a desingularization $\tilde{X}$ of the blow-up of the latter scheme in X : the K-P equation still makes sense on $\tilde{X}$, because the vector fields D_1, D_2 and D_3 are still defined there; one checks that the strict transform $\tilde{\Theta}$ of Θ is irreducible, and lemma 7 of [S] applies on $\tilde{X}$ to show that $\bigcap_{s \geq 0} D_1^s \tilde{\Theta}$ is equal to $\bigcap_{r,s,t \geq 0} D_1^r D_2^s D_3^t \tilde{\Theta}$, hence is empty. The above ideas applied on $\tilde{X}$ then give a proof of the Novikov conjecture.

Note that $\bigcap_{s \geq 0} D_1^s \Theta$ is a posteriori actually empty, whereas in the other cases, it may happen that $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{2su}$ or $\bigcap_{p,q \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{p(a-c)+q(b-c)}$ are not empty (if for example u , or $a - c$ and $b - c$, are torsion).

6. Complements

In this short section, we will indicate how to combine the techniques used here with those of [D] to get results in the degenerate cases when the theta divisor is not too singular. We will use the following lemma, inspired by proposition 2.6 in [D].

LEMMA 6.1.— *Let (X, λ) be an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety and let Θ be a representative of the polarization. Let x be a non-torsion element of X and assume that Z is a component of $\Theta \cap \Theta_x$ such that Z_{red} is contained in $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{sx}$. Assume that $\text{codim}_X(Z \cap \text{Sing } \Theta) > 3$. Then Z is reduced.*

Proof. Since $(Z_{\text{red}})_{sx}$ is contained in $\Theta \cap \Theta_x$ for all s , so is $Z_{\text{red}} + A$, where A is the neutral component of the closed subgroup generated by x . It follows that $Z_{\text{red}} + A = Z_{\text{red}}$, hence Z_{red} contains a translate A_z of A , which may further be

assumed to satisfy $\text{codim}_X(A_z \cap \text{Sing } \Theta) > 3$. If Z is not reduced, it is contained in the singular locus of $\Theta \cap \Theta_x$, hence so is A_z . As in the proof of proposition 2.6 of [D], it follows from the Jacobian criterion and the inequality $\text{codim}_X(A_z \cap \text{Sing } \Theta) > 3$ that x is in the kernel of the restriction homomorphism $\text{Pic}^0(X) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(A_z)$, hence so is A . The composed homomorphism $A \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(A)$ is therefore zero. Since it is the morphism associated with the restriction of the polarization λ to A , this implies $A = 0$, which contradicts the fact that x is not torsion. Hence Z is reduced. ■

In the case of a degenerate trisecant, this lemma allows us to prove the following improvement on theorem 2.2 of [D].

THEOREM 6.2.— *Let (X, λ) be a complex principally polarized abelian variety, let Θ be a symmetric representative of the polarization and let $K : X \rightarrow |2\Theta|^*$ be the Kummer morphism. Assume that there exist two points u and v of X such that:*

- (i) *the points $K(u)$ and $K(v)$ are distinct and non-singular on $K(X)$ and the line that joins them is tangent to $K(X)$ at $K(u)$,*
- (ii) *the point u is not torsion,*
- (iii) $\text{codim}_X(\text{Sing } \Theta \cap \bigcap_{s \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{2su}) > 3$.

Then (X, λ) is isomorphic to the Jacobian of a smooth non-hyperelliptic algebraic curve.

Note that by [BD], condition (i) implies: $\text{codim}_X \text{Sing } \Theta \leq 4$.

Proof. We keep the notation of the proof of theorem 3.1. The point is to show that R_n vanishes on the scheme $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$. Let Z be a component of $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$. If Z_{red} is *not* contained in $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbf{Z}} \Theta_{u+2su}$, lemma 3.14 implies that R_n vanishes on Z . Otherwise, lemma 6.1 implies that Z is reduced. On page 9 of [D], it is proved that R_n^2 vanishes on $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$. Since Z is reduced, it follows that R_n vanishes on Z . Hence R_n vanishes on all components of $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_{-u}$, which proves the theorem. ■

Lemma 6.1 has an obvious analog when x is replaced by a non-zero vector field on X . This yields as above an algebraic proof of the Novikov conjecture with the sole extra hypothesis: $\text{codim}_X(\text{Sing } \Theta \cap \bigcap_{s \geq 0} D_1^s \Theta) > 3$. However, this method does not seem to work in the non-degenerate case.

REFERENCES

- [AC] E. Arbarello, C. De Concini, *Another proof of a conjecture of S.P. Novikov on periods of abelian integrals on Riemann surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **54** (1984), 163–178.

- [BD] A. Beauville, O. Debarre: *Une relation entre deux approches du problème de Schottky*, Inv. Math. **86** (1986), 195–207.
- [D] O. Debarre: *Trisecant Lines And Jacobians*, J. Alg. Geom. **1** (1992), 5–14.
- [S] T. Shiota: *Characterization of Jacobian varieties in terms of soliton equations* , Invent. Math. **83** (1986), 333–382.
- [W] G. Welters: *A criterion for Jacobi varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **120** (1984), 497–504.